

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-19 and 21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 14 and 21 are amended, and claims 5 and 9 are canceled, without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Support for amended claims 2, 6 and 21 can be found in the specification, for example, in paragraphs [0124]-[0133]. Support for amended claim 10 can be found in the specification, for example, in paragraph [0089]. Support for amended claims 14 can be found, for example, in original claim 18 and in the specification at paragraph [0047]. Claims 4 and 8 are amended to be consistent with amended claims 2, 6, 10, 14 and 21. Accordingly, no new matter is added. In view of at least the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Nguyen in the April 30, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the personal interview is incorporated into the remarks below.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 2-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,453,302 to Johnson et al. (hereinafter "Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,545 to Morag. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The alleged combination of Johnson and Morag woulds not disclose or suggest "a template selection device that selects a template out of the template storage device according to an average character number per page," and "the average character number per page being based on a total character number of all unpublished articles, a maximum page number to be displayed that stored in a user profile table, and a page number of a layout to be processed," as recited in independent claim 2, and similarly in independent claims 6 and 21 (emphasis added).

Johnson merely discloses a template that retrieves information that is defined by rules, which define the content of the information on the cover page, and integrates the information into the template (see e.g., column 10, lines 28-47). Importantly, the rules in Johnson are not based on an average character number per page, a total character number of all unpublished articles, and a maximum page number that is inputted by a user.

Morag fails to remedy the deficiencies of Johnson. Morag is only relied upon by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of selecting information prior to selecting a template.

The alleged combination of Johnson and Morag also would not disclose or suggest "a user information storage device that stores user information related to a user, the published information selection device being adapted to select published information out of the published information storage device on the basis of the user information in the user information storage device," and "the user information including age, sex, favor, address, or operational environment of a terminal of a user," as recited in independent 14 (emphasis added). Furthermore, the alleged combination of Johnson and Morag would not disclose or suggest "the user information including a maximum number of pages to be displayed," as recited in independent claim 10.

Johnson merely discloses a storage device that stores user information such as company name, logos, or trademarks. See Johnson, for example, column 7, lines 30-33.

Morag fails to remedy the deficiencies of Johnson. As noted above, Morag is only relied upon by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of selecting information prior to selecting a template.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 2, 6, 10, 14 and 21.

Claims 3, 4, 18 and 19 depend from claim 2; claims 7-9 depend from claim 6; claims 11-13 depend from claim 10; and claims 15-17 depend from claim 14. Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of these claims for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features each of these claims recite.

II. Conclusion

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Timothy S. Smith
Registration No. 58,355

JAO:TSS/tbm

Date: June 4, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--